Initial Rubric Review Form:

This rubric is used to evaluate the EPP created assessment

*Based on CAEP Evidence Manual, Section 6, p. 22: “Evidence Created and Administered by EPPs”*

*This rubric is used by the Assistant Dean to evaluate EPP created assessment instrument prior to moving to the next step of the EPP created assessment process. The Assistant dean will approve the instrument and complete the data validity process.*

Dept.: Program Assessment/Rubric Title:

1. **HOW THE ASSESSMENT IS USED**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Response Complete | Response needs Additional Review |
| 1. What is the purpose of the assessment? How does this assessment inform program faculty understanding of candidate development? |  |  |
| 1. At what point in the curriculum is the assessment administered? (e.g. first year, last year, entry course, exit course, etc.)? |  |  |
| 1. How does this assessment align with the program’s developmental sequence for candidates?   *NOTE: This information would be part of the documentation that the assessments are relevant.* |  |  |

1. **CONTENT OF ASSESSMENT** (informs relevancy)

**How is the assessment constructed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric criteria | Yes | No\* |
| 1. Indicators assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards. |  |  |
| 1. Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards. |  |  |
| 1. Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated. |  |  |
| 1. When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the indicators require higher levels of learned behavior (e.g. create, evaluate, analyze, & apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates’ students “demonstrate” problem solving, then the indicator is specific to candidates’ application of knowledge to solve problems. |  |  |
| 1. Most indicators (at least those comprising 80% of the total score) require observers to judge important attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards. |  |  |
| [NOTE: the word “indicators” is used as a generic term for assessment items. For content tests, the term refers to a question. For projects or assignments, it refers to a prompt or task that the candidate is to perform. For an observation, an indicator might be a category of performance to observe or a specific aspect of candidate performance that a reviewer would record. For a survey, an indicator would stand for a question or statement for which a response is to be selected.] |  |  |

1. **SCORING** (informs reliability and actionability)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric criteria | Yes | No\* |
| 1. The basis for judging candidate performance is well defined. |  |  |
| 1. Each Proficiency Level Descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators. |  |  |
| 1. PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (to provide raters with explicit guidelines for evaluating candidate performance and for providing candidates with explicit feedback on their performance). |  |  |
| 1. Feedback provided to candidates is actionable—it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate. |  |  |
| 1. Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. [NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as “engaged,” criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.] |  |  |

1. **DATA RELIABILITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric criteria | Yes | No\* |
| 1. A description or plan is provided that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., test-retest, parallel forms, inter-rater, internal. consistency, etc.) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment. |  |  |
| 1. Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented. |  |  |
| 1. The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability. |  |  |

5. **DATA VALIDITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric Criteria | Yes | No\* |
| 1. A description or plan is provided that detailed steps the EPP has taken or is taking to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use. |  |  |
| 1. The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation or have been established (e.g., construct, content, concurrent, predictive, etc.) and how they were established. |  |  |
| 1. If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted. |  |  |
| 1. The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment. |  |  |
| 1. The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of data from an assessment. |  |  |